IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : 21-cr-00121(JJM)

vs. : United States Courthouse

Providence, Rhode Island

1

JOHN DANIEL MACINTYRE, : Thursday, October 6, 2022

Defendant.

- - - - - - - - - - - - X

TRANSCRIPT OF CRIMINAL CAUSE FOR SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN J. MCCONNELL, JR. UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT COURT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Government: JOHN P. McADAMS, AUSA

U.S. Attorney's Office

50 Kennedy Plaza

Providence, RI 02903

For the Defendant: REBECCA L. AITCHISON, AFPD

FEDERAL DEFENDER'S OFFICE

10 Weybosset Street, Suite 300 Providence, Rhode Island 02903

Court Reporter: Lisa Schwam, CRR-RPR-RMR

One Exchange Terrace Providence, RI 02903

(VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE) 1 2 06 OCTOBER 2022 3 (Time noted; 2:15 p.m.) THE COURT: Good afternoon, everyone. 4 5 here for sentencing in the case of the United States 6 vs. John Daniel Macintyre, criminal action 21-121. 7 Would counsel identify themselves for the 8 record. 9 MR. McADAMS: Good afternoon, your Honor. John 10 McAdams on behalf of the United States. 11 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. McAdams. 12 MS. AITCHISON: Good afternoon, your Honor. 13 Rebecca Aitchison on behalf of John Macintyre. 14 THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Aitchison. 15 Good afternoon, Mr. Macintyre. 16 THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon. 17 THE COURT: Mr. Macintyre, we're conducting this 18 hearing remotely due to the emergency finding by the 19 government that a national emergency due to the 20 pandemic exists and that at times it's not safe for the 21 parties to meet in person. I understand after talking 22 with your attorney that you agree to waive any right to 23 appear in person for your sentencing and you consent to 24 us proceeding remotely; is that true?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

25

THE COURT: I actually also understand you prefer it that way; that's probably the case.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. The probation department, Mr. Macintyre, issued a presentence report in your case.

Did you get a copy of that report?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.

THE COURT: And did you have a chance to review that with your lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I was able to.

THE COURT: Okay. And did she answer all of your questions about that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, she did.

THE COURT: Okay. Great.

So how we're going to proceed, I'm going to review the guideline range which is contained in the PSR. I'll see if there's any objections to it. If not, then Mr. McAdams will present an argument on behalf of the government. Your lawyer will then make her argument on your behalf. You'll then be allowed to speak if you want to or not, it's up to you, and then I'll get on with the business of the sentence, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Understood.

THE COURT: So the guidelines are calculated as follows. Base offense level here is 18. There's two

points added for the use of a computer. There's four points added because the 305 images fall between 300 and 600 images, which gives an adjusted offense level of 24. There's a two-point reduction for acceptance of responsibility.

And does the government wish to make a motion on the third point?

MR. McADAMS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. That will be granted. For a total offense level of 21.

Mr. Macintyre has no criminal history, therefore, no criminal history points. So a total offense of 21, Criminal History Category I, brings with it a recommended period of incarceration of 37 to 46 months.

Any objection, Mr. McAdams?

MR. McADAMS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Aitchison?

MS. AITCHISON: No objection, your Honor.

THE COURT: Great. Thanks. Mr. McAdams.

MR. McADAMS: Thank you, your Honor. Your Honor, I submitted a written sentencing memorandum which I'm sure you've reviewed and also obviously the defense did as well. I won't repeat everything that I wrote in writing.

I've appeared before your Honor in many cases involving this type of offense, and one of the things that I try to say each time is that although there are no victims who are giving victim impact statements in court today or have submitted them, that is not because there are no victims in this case. In fact, there are at least hundreds of victims and possibly thousands based on the statements of the defendant himself. They're not here to make a plea to the Court, and so part of my argument is to try to do that, to try to have a voice for them in this proceeding.

As I indicated in my memorandum, this is a very serious crime; it's a crime of violence against the victims that are in these images and videos. This defendant, by his own admission, has been committing this crime on a near-weekly basis multiple times for approximately 15 years. So I think that that's significantly more than we see in most child pornography cases. It also, I think, understates his criminal history. He's never been convicted of any offense of any kind; this is his first criminal conviction.

I think that in light of the nature of the crime and the duration of the crime, that this defendant ought to be sentenced to a sentence of imprisonment.

My recommendation is a sentence of 42 months, which is approximately midway through the advisory guideline range in this particular case. It's also consistent with the sentences imposed in quite a few, not every, but quite a few of the recent cases in which defendants have been convicted of this offense. The defendant could have been charged with an offense carrying a five-year mandatory minimum. He was not in this particular case, which is also how most of those other defendants were similarly treated who achieve those types of offenses. And I listed a half a dozen, approximately, in my sentencing memo; some of whom were sentenced by your Honor and others who were sentenced by others in this district.

THE COURT: Mr. McAdams, help me with this. How is that comparison fair in light of what my charge is, which is to look at each case individually? And I understand I have to be concerned about disparate sentences but, you know, I looked up Mr. Mulvey just quickly, and his criminal history was extensive, including a domestic violence charge post charged in this case. And obviously, you know, you can say what you want, but we have a very different picture of the person that stands before us here. So I get really concerned with just blindly looking at sentences and

trying to make anything of it.

MR. McADAMS: Well, I don't think you should look at them blindly, but your obligations do include avoiding unwarranted sentencing disparities, and obviously "unwarranted" being the operative word there. So yes, I would agree with you; Mr. Mulvey can be distinguished from this defendant based on his criminal history which was non-child sexual exploitation type criminal history. As you mentioned, it was domestic and there were some alcohol-related incidents as well.

This defendant has been committing this crime every week for 15 years. I think that that is significant, and it isn't to be brushed away by the mere fact that he's now been caught for the first time. So I think that when you -- I've been doing a lot of these cases for about ten years now. And as you know, there are sort of a spectrum of defendants. And we've seen some really horrific cases involving hands-on conduct, and those defendants where we can establish hands-on conduct are sort of in a different category.

And then we've got defendants who are attempting to engage -- the evidence supports, are attempting to engage in hands-on conduct that maybe is intervened with by law enforcement. And then there are defendants whom the evidence that's provable shows that they are

pornography or some combination thereof.

engaged in viewing or receiving or distributing child

THE COURT: I agree with those three, Mr.

McAdams, but don't you have to take the third category and separate those out as well because within that child-pornography-only case, you have folks that are actively engaged in distribution -- well, first of all, you have manufacturers, but I throw them up with the hands-on. Then you have people that are actively engaged in distribution, and then you have -- and where there's concern about possible hands-on in the past.

And then you have people that are, for lack of "only" term, viewed as only.

And what's surprising about this case that I'm curious about, because I know the other cases that I did, every one of them had a distribution charge in them that in plea bargaining the Court -- sorry, the U.S. Attorney's Office, you know, would negotiate away, for valid reason, you know, as part of the process, but this one didn't. And I'm curious if I should consider the fact that there was never a distribution charge here to represent a lower culpability, if that makes sense.

MR. McADAMS: So I guess I would say two things. I don't know that it's the case that all of those

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

involved with a distribution charge because the statute that criminalizes distribution and criminalizes receipt is the same statute.

THE COURT: Distribution or receipt, either one.

MR. McADAMS: Correct, correct.

So that statute is the statute that carries the five-year mandatory minimum. And I think that the evidence supports, it's undeniable, essentially, that this defendant also engaged in that type of behavior. He received, by his own admission, hundreds of thousands -- excuse me, hundreds or thousands of child pornography images through the Tor browser that he downloaded onto his computer and going back even ten years ago back through LimeWire which was a peer-to-peer file-sharing system which back at that time period in 2010, the case law was that if you had that software on your computer, that was evidence that you were distributing, because whatever you were putting in your election was available to anyone else who wanted to come along. The case law changed over time about that particular fact, but going back then, that's how it would have been.

So I think this defendant fits with the types of defendants that we have seen consistently that we don't have evidence of any type of hands-on offense, but we

see them viewing child pornography and downloading child pornography on their computers. And what we've done pretty consistently is distinguish those defendants by if they have any position of trust in the community that we are particularly concerned about, such as a member of the clergy, a teacher, a coach, et cetera, those people we will insist on that five-year mandatory minimum for receipt. And the people that don't fall into that category, and I've done a number of these with Ms. Aitchison, where we agree to some other range that's below that five years. And that's typically we either do it as a binding plea or a binding recommendation or a joint recommendation, there's been kind of some ebb and flow in how that's played out.

In this particular case, I didn't negotiate. I don't know exactly what the rationale was that I think it was a quick agreement between Ms. Aitchison and Mr. Gendron that he would plead to an information shortly after he was charged on the complaint and that's what led to him sort of pleading straight to the information rather than being required to forgo that. I mean, he's not -- there is no plea agreement so he's not protected from that five-year charge. Now, I mean, we're good-faith operators -- I'm not going to go and

do that -- but I don't know exactly why they wouldn't have wanted to do that to protect him and then, you know, in our view.

So the way I look at it is how does he compare to defendants that we've been handling this way going back roughly as long as I've been doing these types of cases, which is the early 2010s, the beginning of the -- you know, around -- I think I started doing PSC cases in 2013. The sort of threshold year in my mind is 2016 when I started doing a lot of these cases with others in the office and we really made a concerted effort to be consistent internally in how we were handling similarly situated defendants.

And it's not easy; you know this, your Honor, because every case is a little different and every defendant is a little different. But at some level you have to create some form of consistency. And that's where ranges are appropriate, right? And so I don't think in looking at this case that this particular defendant has anything crying out to me that separates him from, you know, the dozen or more, two dozen or more, defendants that have been sentenced for possession of child pornography in this district in the last eight to then years.

THE COURT: Did you not read the licensed social

worker report that --

MR. McADAMS: I did read it, your Honor.

THE COURT: I've never seen that before.

MR. McADAMS: I've seen it. Ms. Aitchison has submitted several to me over the years, frequently authored by the same social worker, Mr. Keating. I've yet to see one in which he didn't come to the exact same conclusion.

THE COURT: I guess when he doesn't, they don't send them to you.

MR. McADAMS: That's what I suspect as well.

But, I mean, I have some issues with this.

A couple of years ago, your Honor, I had a trial in front of Judge Smith. And in that trial, the heart of the defense was that the defendant had engaged in fantasy and they called as an expert witness Dr. Barry Wall, a highly respected psychiatrist, a medical doctor. He testified at length at that trial, and I cross-examined him at length at that trial, about all these same tests that were given by Mr. Keating in this particular case.

And while we haven't been provided with any of the questions or answers that were given by Mr. Keating to Mr. Macintyre, in that case we were. And what you see is, and what Dr. Wall acknowledged on the stand, is

that those tests are very heavily driven by what the defendant volunteers. And they are actually possible to be manipulated. And much of what is done -- because the people that are giving these tests, whether a psychiatrist or a social worker, they're not criminal investigators. They don't look at this from the perspective of trying to drill down forensically to the truth in a legal/criminal sense of what actually occurred; they're treating these people.

So Mr. Keating is trying to provide some options to Ms. Aitchison, and also they're looking at these individuals as a patient. And so they take at face value many of the statements that are made because that's what doctors are trained to do.

And to me when you look at Mr. Keating's report, you see a number of things. First of all, on its face, it says that the defendant is sexually attracted to both males and females between the ages of 6 and 13.

THE COURT: It's more than just 6 to 13; it's also adult males and female adults.

MR. McADAMS: Correct.

THE COURT: I've never seen a report, Mr.

McAdams, to be honest with you, that has the breadth of sexual interest that I saw listed in this report. I've never seen that before.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. McADAMS: The exact same results were in Mr. Hammond, who was the defendant in that particular He was, according to the results, sexually attracted to every age, every gender, every race, every ethnicity. And you know, what's interesting to me about this is this is a psychosexual report and there's no discussion really of how any of these sexual interests correlate to his risk. I mean, the conclusion is he's at a near -- I think the exact phrase is a very low risk, extremely low risk, to commit a future offense. But there's no real discussion of why that would be. It's contrary, frankly, to our anecdotal knowledge of defendants in this district that have been convicted of this offense and it doesn't make sense.

If an individual has, as Mr. Keating says here, sexual interest in children -- okay, other ages as well, but clearly according to the -- sexual interest in children as young as 6 years old, and on page 5 I believe it says sexuality may be a major problem for this young man; he harbors serious reservations as well as a measure of confusion or discontent in relation to his impulses and the roles he's expected to assume and yet how does that correlate?

If somebody has a sexual interest in children

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and serious problems with sexual confusion and serious problems with impulse control, how does that correlate to then be an extremely low risk to re-offend?

Logically, it just doesn't follow. And there is no real discussion about it.

THE COURT: Mr. McAdams, I mean, look, I'm not a doctor, you're not a doctor; we just play one on TV, right, in situations like this. And I don't mean to go back and forth because it's kind of the same argument all along, but for someone that's like that -- and you're right, we see similar things in a whole lot of these cases -- the question then becomes, is there any difference in outcome between someone who goes to jail for, as you're recommending here, four years, and those I mean, there's no cure for this that didn't? predilection, right; we all accept that. We know that there's treatment to mitigate it and there's treatment to keep it in check, and there's treatment to deal with it, but to somehow say that punishment is a way to change someone's behavior given the situation, it isn't.

Punishment for the purpose of punishment, which 3553 requires us to do, makes perfect sense to me. Hold on just one second. Let me get it out and then we can. But I don't now, nor do I ever, buy the argument

in these cases that jail time checks off the box of deterrence because science tells us otherwise. And there are no statistics that tell us that a jail term causes less recidivism in this area. I've looked for it; it doesn't exist.

So the better argument I think -- I don't mean to give you the argument -- from my receptive point of view, this kind of conduct deserves to be punished for punishment sake because it's so bad and so evil and so, you know, what you want. But I just have a really hard time arguing that punishment has any -- that jail has any sort of deterrence or curative effect.

MR. McADAMS: Well, my response to that, respectfully, Judge, is that obviously I respect your opinion on that and where you're coming from on that and at the end of the day it's your interpretation that's going to drive what sentence you give, but both the Supreme Court and Congress disagree with the assessment that you just made.

THE COURT: Not the first time.

MR. McADAMS: Right. No, and it probably won't be the last. We all are entitled to have our own opinions. But, you know, the Supreme Court has said that the logic of deterrence is a primary driver and should be a primary driver in sentences in child

pornography cases and oftentimes citing Congress's specific findings and specific statements that they believe that punishment of individuals who possess child pornography materials will affect the dissemination of this material and will drive down deterrence.

Now, obviously, if you don't want to accept it, you don't have to accept it, but that's the argument and it's not John McAdams, it's those authorities. And I've cited a bunch of cases, and you've seen them and read them and I know you have.

The second piece is, what you just urged me to argue, would be the next argument I was going to make anyway, which is that this person -- and he is a person and I don't mean to -- I don't lack empathy or caring for this person -- he has committed this offense nearly two to three times a week for 15 years. So even if you don't believe sentencing him to prison will stop him from doing it again, he ought to be held accountable for the behavior that he's already engaged in. And even if you accept all of the conclusions and recommendations that Mr. Keating has laid out in his report, I don't think those still rise to the level of giving this defendant a complete pass on a prison sentence.

And then the last thing I would say is, again, just circling back to the beginning, it's important for the victims of these cases that people like Mr.

Macintyre, who have undeniably fueled the demand for their abuse by engaging in this behavior -- he's not one of these people who came across this, he's been deeply involved and going after this type of material for well over a decade, half his life or close to it. And he's got a college education, you know. He admitted in his own interview, he understood this was wrong. He may have an addiction, he may have a sexuality problem that can't be solved, but I don't think telling him not to do it again addresses the needs under 3553.

And then I guess I did promise it would be my last point. One last point, which is the following. I don't think we do defendants like Mr. Macintyre any service when we impose a straight probationary sentence on them knowing that if he gets caught again, it's ten years' mandatory minimum. Nobody on this Zoom screen has any discretion over that.

THE COURT: Can I interrupt you on that because I actually had that conversation with Molly beforehand. But that's true whether he gets a probationary sentence or if he gets a jail term.

MR. McADAMS: I agree. But I think giving him a jail term will send a much stronger message to him. I think that we've seen -- Ms. Aitchison has clients -- I think people like Mr. Andreozzi that recently got sentenced to ten years by Judge McElroy, you know, were probably shocked to learn that they were getting ten years and that there was nothing anyone could do about it.

And I think that if you go to prison for a period of time, then the deterrent value of being an inmate in a federal prison maybe makes you take it a little bit more seriously the next time than being told, you know, you've got a problem, you've got to go to your counselor; you have to solve it in the other ways that are non-incarcerative.

I say all that, Judge, with respect in terms of our disagreement.

THE COURT: Actually, we ended it as not disagreeing particularly, per se.

MR. McADAMS: Okay. I have nothing else to say, your Honor, except that I do think that even though Mr. Macintyre is represented by the public defender, that he's still eligible to pay the \$5,000 mandatory special assessment. That requirement is not coterminous with eligibility for appointed counsel, and based on the

information in the PSR about his financial ability to pay a fine, I think he ought to pay the \$5,000 special assessment.

THE COURT: John, am I correct that there's been no claim for restitution in this particular case?

MR. McADAMS: That's correct, your Honor, because we did submit all the images to NCMEC, but none of the images are known victims to make a restitution claim.

THE COURT: Okay. I just wanted to make sure of that. Thanks. Great. Thanks, Mr. McAdams.

Ms. Aitchison.

MS. AITCHISON: Thank you, your Honor.

The Court sort of touched on some of the pieces of my argument, so I'll try to be brief in those areas.

THE COURT: You can make it again, and then I can attack my argument through you when you make it.

MS. AITCHISON: Okay. We can go back and forth a few times too.

Your Honor, at this time we're asking that you sentence Mr. Macintyre to a nonjail sentence. We would not oppose any particular conditions that you felt were appropriate including home confinement restrictions of that nature. I know in my sentencing memorandum I suggested some community service because I thought it

the Court's discretion and leave it at that.

could be helpful. Mr. McAdams alludes to a fine. I would agree that Mr. Macintyre's financial situation is different than many of my clients, so I'll leave it to

THE COURT: Let me just interrupt you. Mr. McAdams I don't think was recommending a fine. He was recommending that I not waive the \$5,000 JVTA.

MS. AITCHISON: Oh, sorry, yes. My rationale still stands, but I appreciate the correction.

THE COURT: Sure.

MS. AITCHISON: But it's rare I think, your Honor, that probation is appropriate in child pornography cases. I strongly submit to you this is one of those cases.

I thought a lot about this case in preparation for today and about Mr. Macintyre, and here's what I kept coming back to. So there's a national criminal defense college that puts on sort of a -- it's like a trial school litigation academy every year for two weeks. It used to be in Macon, Georgia, and interestingly is now in Bristol, Rhode Island.

THE COURT: My college and law school roommate is a faculty member of that.

MS. AITCHISON: Okay. So you're familiar with the school. It's a right of passage for criminal

defense lawyers. I went back in 2015.

And they sell a lot of items, but one of the things that I purchased is a T-shirt. And the T-shirt has the logo from the college on it, but then it says in big letters, "We Don't Defend Crimes, We Defend People." And I kept coming back to that T-shirt as I was thinking about this because I don't know that I can put it any better than that. I'm not sitting here saying to you child pornography should equal probation; what I'm saying to you is that John Macintyre, the person before you, should get probation, he is deserving of probation.

The government, as they do in a lot of these cases and I understand why, they like to focus on the crime, right. Their argument is often very largely about how terrible child pornography is, but it's not victimless, right, and then they included a number of other cases which I'll get to. But I want to be very clear that no one here is suggesting that child pornography isn't horrible, and we're certainly not suggesting it's victimless, but there's a reason that we don't just shell out the same sentence in every case, and there's a reason that we have this incredibly individualized sentencing process in the federal system. And that's because just like I don't defend

crimes, I defend people, you, as the Court, sentence people, not just crimes.

And that's what I think brings us to the sentencing disparity argument the government made. I appreciate the fact that the Court raised some of the arguments that I was going to raise. Here's what I can say, your Honor. While I suppose, theoretically, in every case the government could charge receipt based on the inference that if you possess something, you receive it, we don't see it, the receipt portion, as often in this district as we do with distribution. The receipt cases, at least that I've seen, generally involve an individual in a chatroom, right, who is receiving images from someone else. It's a little bit more to it than sort of just this inference.

But what I can tell this Court is that receipt was never a discussion in this case. There was never a negotiation in this case where, you know, Mr. Macintyre agreed to plead guilty in exchange for not charging him with receipt. That was never part of this; that's why there's no plea agreement. And so I'm a little troubled at this idea that the government -- I appreciate Mr. McAdams saying, you know, that they're at their word, they wouldn't now charge him, but I want to be clear, there was never that discussion. So I

don't want there to be this implication somehow that there was a discussed break for Mr. Macintyre.

And that leads me to the other cases that the government referenced. And I know you pointed out State vs. Mulvey which is one of them. I'm not going to go through each and every single one, but what I can say is what the Court essentially said; every single one of them had receipt or distribution attached to it, whether it was in the complaint and charged and later dismissed and not indicted or the government put in the plea agreement that they had evidence of receipt but were agreeing not to charge it. Some had multiple counts of distribution. Some, as you brought out with Mr. Mulvey, had a violation of bail after being charged. One defendant had a money laundering count dismissed.

And I'll also point out, your Honor, that every single one of those cases -- because I also looked them up -- had a plea agreement where there was a joint recommendation. Every single one of those defendants had higher guidelines than Mr. Macintyre. They're not comparable. I did find two cases in this district where the defendant was charged with just possession. And when I say "just possession," I mean, there's no mention anywhere of receipt or distribution. It's not

in the complaint. It's not in the plea agreement. I can't speak to the evidence, but the docket is silent on that issue.

And the defendant appears before the Court pleading to possession and is sentenced. The first is *Decredico*, which is 15-CR-36. His guidelines were 78 to 97 months and he received 12 months and a day. The second is *Donald Sly*, that's 20-CR-44. His guidelines were 46 to 57 months. He received five years' probation. Both defendants had higher guidelines than Mr. Macintyre. So if you look at defendants who are actually and truly similarly situated to Mr. Macintyre, our request of probation is reasonable if you look at that.

Your Honor, if you choose to punish Mr.

Macintyre with a jail sentence because of the seriousness of the crime, we understand that, but the idea that we penalize him additionally for being open with law enforcement for admitting that he has a problem, for wanting help, I ask you to reject that. I can tell you that oftentimes the government will come in and argue that this individual hasn't taken responsibility for what they've done; they've minimized their conduct, they have misled the agents, right.

We have the exact opposite here. We have

someone who sat down and just talked to law enforcement, talked to them about things that they have no ability to prove in court, right. And I think that goes hand in hand with Leo Keating's evaluation. Mr. McAdams --

THE COURT: Ms. Aitchison, I am shocked by how many people charged with child pornography actually as soon as they're confronted with it spill their guts. I almost say it's routine in the cases that I've got. I don't know why. I don't know if it's a psychological thing like, oh, finally I'm relieved of this deep, dark secret -- I don't know what it is -- but almost every case I've seen that I can remember, it's been that case.

MS. AITCHISON: I certainly haven't seen a case similar to this where there's sort of a disclosure of kind of this long history of behavior -- I think it's a little unique -- but, you know, I accept the Court's representation. But, you know, Mr. McAdams talks about, okay, these evaluations are problematic because they rely on what the person tells the evaluator, right. I think that cuts against their argument because we here have someone who sat down and said here is everything I have done and was completely open and honest about it. And someone with over 20 years of

experience -- by the way, Leo Keating's firm is frequently used by the courts in Massachusetts in the dangerousness assessments that they have over there.

So someone with over 20 years of experience listened to all of that and prepared the report for you that you see. And I submitted it even though there are aspects to it that aren't great, but it's honest and it's truthful; and to a certain extent, sure, we can't ever know if someone's a true risk, but if you have someone who says, okay, I've been looking at images for ten years and there's never been so much as an allegation of anything else, I think it's hard to argue that they're a danger in the sense of proceeding to sort of hands-on offenses which I think is probably at the back of everyone's mind in cases like this, right; we want to make sure that it doesn't kind of escalate, right, and kind of perpetuate that.

We have no evidence he's ever chatted with anyone, ever tried to meet up with anyone. He's never sought out any minors. So I think that that cuts against the government's argument. I think the Court hit the nail on the head; it's really whether or not incarceration is necessary. You can always make the argument that prison supports punishment, of course. It's generally the most extreme version of punishment

that we have, but it's not the only version.

And we know that punishment can be accomplished in all kinds of ways. And in a case like this, we also have this whole area of profoundly effective collateral consequences, right. We have someone who is college educated and a very hard worker, who has worked really hard to get himself to a place of stability, financial and otherwise, and build up a life for himself and a reputation and he's now going to be a sex offender.

This is going to make it into the local news, right. People in his town are all going to know. The people that he works with are all going to know. The first job that he had that he had for years fired him when he was arrested. I don't know that the second job will keep him on. I hope they do, but they may fire him. Any job that he applies for in the future, this will be brought up and he'll have to discuss it. He's going to have a felony conviction for the rest of his life.

And then there are the consequences down the road, right. Any time he goes anywhere with his family, he is going to think about now who is there, who is going to be there, can I go to the zoo, can I go wherever. His sister, who he is very close with, submitted a letter with this court. At some point she

may have a family, right. Mr. Macintyre may have to stay home when the entire family goes to watch her child at the talent show or the school fair, right. He may have to sit at home and miss out on those things. Those are all the little things that we don't think about necessarily as punishment, but are incredibly difficult.

And I just ask the Court to look at Mr.

Macintyre, look at his life. I don't think we have someone here who we would characterize as a predator in the sense that -- and I use that phrase bluntly because I think the Court has seen individuals who they have determined to be predators, and I think that that is not Mr. Macintyre. He was looking at a lot of pornography, yes, not just child pornography, adult pornography as well, but it's also a psychological issue for him; it's an illness.

And we know that, and you've brought out this idea that science tells us there's no cure for it, but this is someone who freely admits that he has a problem. He freely admits that he needs help. He's taken steps to get that help.

He's incredibly lucky in that he has family support behind him who supports him and stands by him even though they don't really understand, you know, why

he sort of has this proclivity. But the idea that we somehow punish him more because he acknowledged this because he had this history I think is problematic and flies in the face of logic. I don't think this Court's ever going to see Mr. Macintyre again. I think the Court should have confidence in that given who he is, given his life that he's led to this point.

When we look at rehabilitation, which, you know, the law tells us we need to look at, he clearly needs counseling and services and treatment and that's required by probation, but he also needs it. I don't think we can honestly sit here and say that he would get better treatment and rehabilitation at the Bureau of Prisons than he would in the community. I just don't think that that's true. I think that when you look at the idea of deterrence, it's hard.

I listened to another sentencing this morning that the Court had that had to do with the dark web and the internet, and I always struggle with this idea of general deterrence, your Honor, because we see in the statistics that an overwhelming majority of child pornography defendants get jail. But what I can tell you is it's still a very large portion of our caseload, right; we still get these cases day after day after day.

And you know, the internet is a gift and a curse, right, so I think realistically the idea that putting Mr. Macintyre in jail is going to somehow stop the dissemination of that, I just don't think is practically correct. I understand the argument and I understand the desire to stop it, believe me I do, but practically speaking, I don't think it does.

What I think can make a difference is actually looking at the individual, addressing the underlying issues, getting them help and that makes the difference. It doesn't make what he did any less serious, but it accomplishes what the sentencing factors actually get at, which is how do we put this person in a different situation, how do we protect society, how do we punish them, right. And so when we look at it in that lens, a nonjail sentence is sufficient but no more than necessary; not in every case, not for every defendant, but definitely in this case, your Honor.

And I'm asking the Court to look at Mr.

Macintyre as an individual. And I ask the Court to consider a nonjail sentence with whatever, as I said, conditions you feel are appropriate. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thanks, Ms. Aitchison.

Mr. Macintyre, do you want to say anything

before I impose sentence?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I would like to.

So, your Honor, one of the core principles, the center of my life, is accountability matters. I believe my adherence to accountability is the reason on the morning of my arrest, I was forthcoming about the nature of my crime. For an addict such as myself, it's dangerously easy to minimize, to hide behind the delusions that actions, when done in secret, don't have effect on others.

However, my actions contributed to a culture of exploitation. My viewing of child sexual abuse material was a destructive choice. It was not a choice made a single time but habitually over an extended period of time; A choice emboldened by a false notion that actions taken in secret are divorced from the harm those actions cause.

The first few months after my arrest felt like the darkest era of my life; however, with the passage of time and the aid of my therapist, I discovered the reality of the matter. The truth is, the real darkest era of my life were those moments the last 15 years when I viewed child exploitation material, because in those moments I was victimizing fellow human beings.

Through therapy and self-reflection, I've been

working on understanding why I was drawn to those images and videos. The results of my psychosexual evaluation were enlightening. I now understand that my previously undiagnosed autism, combined with general anxiety, contributed towards my being underdeveloped in certain social skills. In times of stress, I used porn as an escape, and escalation of my pornography consumption led me from legal content to illegal content. And as is the nature of addiction, I ran from high to high looking for a distraction, but it was an empty distraction. And more grievously, it was a distraction that caused exploitation of other people.

It's important for me to state clearly, though, that my autism, depression and anxiety, while contributing factors, are not an excuse for my crime. Hundreds of thousands of people are on the autistic spectrum. Millions of people have anxiety or depression, but only a percentage of those commit crimes. I am among that percentage.

The choice to view child exploitation material was my own. The choice to put off getting treatment for my porn addiction was my own. I made those choices, and I own the ramifications of those choices.

As I actively seek to correct my behavior, I'm profoundly thankful my support system extends beyond

just my therapist. I have the support of my mother and father and sister. They have always stood by me and their support is unwavering. But more importantly, they hold me accountable. In those moments of weakness when my addict mindset tries to minimize or justify destructive behavior, they unflinchingly give me perspective. They hold me to a high standard.

I believe very deeply in the importance of being a hard worker. While I admittedly neglected aspects of my personal life, employment has remained a constant because each day should be filled with actions of value. As I continue to use therapy to address my social issues, I look forward to transferring my hard work ethic to other aspects of my life.

I come before you ready for my sentence, whatever form it takes, because I understand criminal action needs to be addressed. What matters above all else is I never again create victims. I wish to leave a positive imprint on the world, and that mission will remain the center of every action I take going forward in life.

THE COURT: Thanks, Mr. Macintyre.

It's probably hard for you to sit here when Mr. McAdams, Ms. Aitchison and I and Ms. Picozzi from probation all have history and experience and could

fill in each other's sentences oftentimes, because I'm sure you know, you're not the first and, sadly, you won't be the last that comes before us with this crime.

And there's two overriding things that -- Congress tells us we have to look at -- and I do do what Congress tells me I have to do. They tell us we have to look at various aspects of why we sentence people, and we have to try and factor them all in. We call them 3553 factors, but they are as they say to a court, you have to sentence people to punish the crime, you have to sentence people to deter them, make sure they don't do it again. You have to sentence people to deter others, you have to sentence people in order to assist with their rehabilitation, you have to sentence people to show the respect for the law. And then when you do all that, you have to find a sentence that's enough to do all those things, but not more than necessary to do all those things.

So in every case, what makes every case unique, aren't always the facts but -- well, they are the facts, but they are the facts as to which of those five or six reasons that Congress tells us to consider mean more to us. And I think you probably picked up from my conversation with Mr. McAdams that in your instance when I look at the 3553 factors, the one that really

strikes me -- or it's actually two because they're kind of the same thing, which is punishment and respect for the law, that those are the ones that stand out for me given your background and history.

I don't believe for someone like you that jail is the only way to deter you. And I don't believe what I give you today has any sort of deterrent effect on others. But I do believe that my sentence has to punish you, and I do believe that my sentence has to show you that there's accountability for breaking the law. And I obviously agree with all the attorneys that this is not a victimless crime. You may be far down the ladder of closeness to the evil, but it's no less evil, and it's a no less horrible part of the ladder.

And then the other thing that it's actually not in 3553, I don't think, but that we do have to consider, is what Mr. McAdams says which is disparities within -- maybe it is in there, I don't know -- it's somewhere in a statute somewhere that tells us we have to consider disparities. And I've sentenced less people than Ms. Aitchison has represented or less people than Mr. McAdams has prosecuted charged with child pornography -- I've probably sentenced 30, 40, I'm guessing, over my 10, 11 years -- and I think all but two have gone to jail is my -- I haven't studied

this, but that's off the top of my head.

And in each one of those cases, there was a unique aspect -- each one of the cases of nonjail, there was a unique aspect to them that caused me to determine that there were alternative ways to accomplish the sentencing goals without jail. One was an 18 year old -- another Bishop Hendricken graduate, as a matter of fact, as am I.

You're LaSalle, aren't you, Mr. McAdams?

MR. McADAMS: Your Honor, I'm from

THE COURT: Oh, no, forget it.

Massachusetts. I'm Archbishop Williams.

I can't remember his name, sadly, right now, but there was one in particular early on that was that.

And I don't remember what the other one was; I just remember someone telling me it was one other time.

And the truth is, when I focus on punishment and I focus on respect for the law, your lawyer has convinced me that you will be punished without a jail sentence. This is one of those rare and unusual cases where the Court does not need to send you to jail in order to punish you or to accomplish respect for the law or any of the 3553 factors. It's very unusual, but yours is that unusual case; both after reading -- understanding it came from the defendant, but reading

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the psychological report that came and the undiagnosed autism spectrum disorder.

Your argument by the attorney -- I don't know why she chose August Wilson, I don't know that I've ever told anyone that August Wilson is my favorite playwright, who I've actually taken whole classes about, but somehow she was going to win me over when she began with the August Wilson quote. But seriously, the effect of a felony on someone like you, felony conviction, particularly a sexual offender conviction, will punish you severely. I don't need to repeat everything your lawyer said because she did the best job I've heard about the punishing effect that this will have on someone like you. And your statement today actually, and what I've read about you in the PSR, shows me that you understand accountability and respect for the law as a meaningful aspect. because it is statutorily allowed and called for. The Court's going to impose a period of five years of probation.

Do I have that right, Ms. Picozzi?

PROBATION OFFICER: Yes, your Honor. You can impose up to five years of probation.

THE COURT: Okay. That's what I thought. Thanks, I appreciate that.

The Court's going to impose a period of five years of probation. A fine, per se, is not appropriate; however, the Court will impose the \$100 mandatory assessment and the 5,000 JVTA payment. But because of your representation by the public defender and your financial condition, the Court finds that you are not responsible for the AVAA 17,000. But the Court will impose the \$5100 special assessment.

And Mr. Macintyre, in addition to the standard conditions of supervised release, you shall participate in a program of mental health treatment and sex offender specific treatment, both as directed and approved by probation. You shall participate in testing in the form of polygraphs or other methodology approved by the Court to measure compliance with supervision or treatment. You shall contribute to the cost of all such treatment and testing based on your ability to pay as determined by probation.

You shall comply with all applicable federal and state laws regarding registration of sex offenders in the state of residence, employment and school attendance and shall provide verification of compliance with this requirement to probation. You shall permit probation, who may be accompanied by local, state or federal law enforcement authorities, upon reasonable

suspicion of a violation of supervision, to conduct a search of your residence, automobile, workplace, computer or other electronic communication data device or media.

You must not use, possess, procure or otherwise obtain any electronic device that can be linked to any computer networks, bulletin boards, internet service providers or exchange formats involving computers unless preapproved by probation. You must submit to unannounced examinations of your computer or other electronic equipment by probation, who may be accompanied by either local, state or federal law enforcement authorities, which may include retrieval and copying of all data from the computer to ensure compliance with this condition.

In addition, you must consent to the removal of such equipment for the purpose of conducting a more thorough investigation and must allow, at the direction of probation, installation on your computer or other electronic equipment any hardware or software system to monitor your computer use.

You shall have no contact with any child under the age of 18 without the presence of an adult who is aware of your criminal history and is approved in advance by probation. You shall not loiter in areas

1 where children congregate. These include, but are not 2 limited to, schools, daycare centers, playgrounds, 3 arcades, amusement parks, recreation parks and youth 4 sporting events. 5 You shall not be employed in any occupation, business or profession, or participate in any volunteer 6 7 activity where there is access to children under the 8 age of 18, unless authorized in advance by probation. 9 And you shall live in a residence approved by probation 10 and not reside with anyone under the age of 18 unless 11 approved in advance by probation. 12 Ms. Picozzi, have I left anything out from 13 probation's perspective? 14 PROBATION OFFICER: No, your Honor. 15 THE COURT: Great. Anything further for the 16 government? 17 No, your Honor, thank you. MR. McADAMS: 18 Ms. Aitchison, anything further for THE COURT: 19 Mr. Macintyre? 20 MS. AITCHISON: No, thank you, your Honor. 21 Mr. Macintyre, I think -- Ms. THE COURT: 22 Picozzi, will someone from probation be in touch with 23 Mr. Macintyre? 24 PROBATION OFFICER: Yes. Brandon Miles will be

contacting you later today to set up reporting

25

```
1
       instructions.
 2
               THE DEFENDANT:
                                Okay.
 3
               THE COURT: Thank you all. I appreciate it.
       We'll stand adjourned.
 4
 5
               (Time noted; 3:08 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

CERTIFICATION I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. November 22, 2022 Official Court Reporter